

Later on though those same exemptions were totally exempt and at that time we did not accept the responsibility on this floor, whoever was here at the time. Whoever was here at the time and may still be here, I'm not even sure how they voted and I don't really care and that's not an issue at this point. The point is though that at that time there didn't seem to be much of a worry at all about replacing those funds, and since then with the court ordered exemptions and other legislatively adopted exemptions, we have shifted from about 72 to 92 percent of the revenues at the local jurisdictions, on an average, being property tax. If we didn't worry then about treating the local subdivisions of government fairly or trying to find a replacement, I'm curious to know why at this particular time when there seems to be such an effort on the part of most people to do away altogether with the personal property tax, why we would be worried now about replacing it. Apparently, times have changed. We now know that 1992 the assessed value on real and personal property including motor vehicles is about \$54,302,000,000 and we know that about \$50,300,000,000 of that is being taxed. But the list of the personal property valuations, just valuations now, not taxed, include depreciated livestock, \$1,927,000,000; other livestock, \$2,173,000,000; farm machinery, \$3,200,000,000; farm inventory, \$1,800,000,000; business inventory, \$4 billion and railroad rolling stock, \$570,000. We want to protect those exemptions and I can understand that. And especially if you're from an area where this kind of industry is important, I can understand why you would even do that, but don't try to protect that and not understand at the same time that motor vehicles should also be exempt from personal property tax. It is my understanding then in some cases in these industries where they have vehicles that are used, in fact, to go back and forth to town that they are considered business equipment and there is no personal property tax paid on those. And the example I used yesterday still is the same today. Those people who work for somebody else and live in north Omaha and have to drive to south Omaha to work pay a tax on that vehicle. If they live in Omaha and have to drive to Lincoln or live in York and have to drive to Seward, wherever it might be, that tax is paid and they drive that vehicle so they can get to work. What's the difference? What's the difference if they have that motor vehicle on their place in the country and simply drive it to somewhere else to do whatever it is, may or may not be work? So I didn't think it was necessarily important or incumbent on me to tell you exactly where to make up that \$100 million, but you can take your pick.